

References

1. **Significantly less pain with previous generation Sirius Pintuition technology when compared to WGL.** G.M. Struik and B. Schermers et al., *Breast J.*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 638–650, 2021, doi: 10.1111/tbj.14262.
2. **Significantly less pain with RSL when compared to WGL (P=0.038);** P. J. Lovrics et al., *Ann. Surg. Oncol.*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 3407–14, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.1245/s10434-011-1699-y.
3. **Significantly increased odds at stress (OR 2.07, p = 0.01) and discomfort (OR 1.94, p < 0.01) for WGL compared to RSL.** Ong, J. S. L., et al. (2017). *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*, 43(12), 2261–2269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2017.09.021>
4. **Significantly less anxious for wire-free localization versus WGL; P = 0.009.** Micha, A et al. (2021). *Breast Cancer*, 28(1), 196–205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12282-020-01149-1>
5. **Wire-free localization was scored by surgeons with a 4.9/5.0 for the ability to start cases earlier, 4.4/5.0 for patient wait times, and 4.4/5.0 for a reduction in OR schedule delays. 85% reported workflow improvement over WGL.** Cox, C. E., et al. (2016). *Annals of Surgical Oncology*, 23(10), 3168–3174. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-016-5405-y>
6. **“There was a 34% increase in scheduled biopsy slot utilization, 50% savings in time spent scheduling, and a 4.1-day average decrease in biopsy wait time after RSL institution.”** Sharek, D., et al. (2015). *AJR. American Journal of Roentgenology*, 204(4), 872–877. <https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.14.12743>
7. **“[T]he wire may dislodge, migrate, fracture or even become transected during surgery, all resulting in a loss of guidance.”** Schermers, B., et al (2017). *The Breast*, 33, 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2017.03.003>
8. **Significantly higher rated usability of previous generation Sirius Pintuition technology when compared to WGL. Surgeons significantly prefer Sirius Pintuition technology over WGL.** G.M. Struik and B. Schermers et al., *Breast J.*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 638–650, 2021, doi: 10.1111/tbj.14262.
9. **“Surgeons ranked the seed technique as easier (P= .008), while radiologists ranked them similarly.”** P. J. Lovrics et al., *Ann. Surg. Oncol.*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 3407–14, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.1245/s10434-011-1699-y.
10. **“We would envisage that the device will be logistically easier for radiological placement and would lead to a reduction in operating theatre delays, which could provide financial savings.”** Harvey, J. R., et al. (2018). *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*, 0123456789. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-018-4709-y>
11. **“[R]educed re-excision rates and improvements in utilization of radiology and theatre lists are likely to lead to improved cost-effectiveness.”** Taylor, D. B., et al. (2021). *British Journal of Surgery*, 108(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjs/znaa008>
12. **“The cost of the magnetic seeds and probe system was offset by the anticipated value of shorter procedure times for radiologists, increased OR efficiency for first-start cases, and the ability to schedule the localization procedure days to weeks in advance of surgery.”** Miller, M. E., et al. (2021). *Annals of Surgical Oncology*, 28(6), 3223–3229. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-09311-x>
13. **Significantly lower OR start delays for wire free localization compared to WGL.** Srour, M. K. et al. (2019). *The Breast Journal*, July, tbj.13499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbj.13499>
14. **“[Wire-free] localization technologies perform at least as good as WGL, with an average positive margin outcome of 11.2% (276/2460). Eleven comparative studies find no significant differences, a single study finds a significant benefit favoring wire-free localization. The positive margin rate combined for all technologies is 12.5% (472/3782). The reoperation rate (second surgical procedure required) combined for all technologies is 14.8% (391/2636)”** Sirius Internal Literature Evaluation 000930v3.0 covering multiple wire-free devices.
15. **“Complications or adverse events related to marker-based localization technologies are mild, most are not device related (i.e. general post-operative complications) and in all cases when were compared to a control group, they were similar between groups.”** Sirius Internal Literature Evaluation 000930v3.0 covering multiple wire-free devices.
16. **Ottawa Hospital (Canada) found that their per-localization cost was \$1,130 for wire, and \$250 for wire-free. Overall, a cost reduction of 78% per patient for wire-free localization versus WGL.** Zhang, Y et al. (2017). *Annals of Surgical Oncology*, 125 <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-017-6084-z>